

Amendments to the drawings

Figure 2 has been amended as set forth on the “Replacement Sheet” attached hereto.

REMARKS

The applicant has thoroughly considered the Official Action dated March 4, 2005, and have prepared this Amendment in response thereto. A Petition for One Month Extension of Time, and the required petition fee, has been filed concurrently with this Amendment.

The applicant has amended Figure 2 in accordance with the examiner's helpful suggestions. The applicant thanks the examiner for the allowance of claims 6 – 14 and the identification of claim 2, as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. In light of this identification, the applicant has amended claims 1 to include the limitation of original claim 2, and cancelled claims 2 and 3 – 5. The applicant amended claim 15 to correct typographical errors uncovered during review of the claims, and not in response to the rejection thereof. Claims 1, 3 and 6 – 15. remain pending in the application.

The following remarks will follow the order set forth in the Office Action.

Drawings

The applicant acknowledges the defect in FIG. 2 and has corrected this drawing figure and submitted the attached replacement sheet reflecting this correction. In particular, the replacement sheet includes the lead line to reference number "1002", which was omitted the original drawing. The applicant believes that FIG. 2, as amended, complies with 37 CFR 1.121(d) and respectfully requests that this objection be reconsidered and withdrawn in light of the applicants' amendments.

Claim Rejections 35 USC §103

Claims 1, 3-5 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC §103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2,377,881 (hereafter "Hans") and U.S. Patent No. 5,228,661 (hereafter "Bigham").

As denoted by the cited passage from Hans, the device described therein is adapted for use in a traditional manner; i.e. to wind the rope or cable around the hub, effectively pulling the vehicle toward a fixed object. Similarly, it may be operated as winch to pull an object toward it. Nowhere does Hans disclose or suggest the use of the hub in unwinding mode, as is claimed in claim 15.

Bigham discloses a winch for assisting in the retrieval of a spare tire from a vehicle, does not pull any object through unwinding, and certainly does not suggest such an arrangement when mounted to a vehicle tire.

Finally, none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests engaging the drive wheel of said vehicle such that the vehicle moves away from the object and such that the flexible pulling member unwinds from the hub, or the disengagement of a pulling member from a hub after an object has been pulled by it.

Accordingly, as none of the cited references discloses or suggests a method having the steps claimed in claim 15, the applicant asserts that claim 15 is not obvious and respectfully requests that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is felt that a full and complete response has been made to the Official Action and, as such, places the application in condition for allowance. Such allowance is hereby respectfully requested. If the examiner feels, for any reason, that a personal interview will expedite the prosecution of this application, the examiner is invited to phone the applicant's attorney at the number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Date _____

Michael J. Persson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 41,248
Lawson & Persson, P.C.
67 Water Street, Suite 103
Laconia, NH 03246
Phone: 603-528-0023
Fax: 603-528-3332
Email: mike@laconialaw.com